



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SEMITIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES

---

VOLUME XXXIV

OCTOBER 1917

---

NUMBER 1

## THE TEMPLE WOMEN OF THE CODE OF HAMMURABI

By D. D. LUCKENBILL  
University of Chicago

In an article entitled "The Consecrated Women of the Hammurabi Code"<sup>1</sup> Professor Lyon has called in question the generally accepted interpretation of certain sections of that Code of Babylonian law. Since the appearance of this essay (1912), which was of course based upon the text of the standard (stela) edition of the Code found at Susa in December of 1901 and January of 1902, portions of a number of "law-court" editions, written on clay tablets, have come to light. The new versions, which in part cover the sections discussed by Lyon, are published in Langdon's *Historical and Religious Texts* (1914), No. 22 (Plates 20 and 21), and in Poebel's *Historical and Grammatical Texts* (1914), No. 93 (Plates 39 and 40). As we shall see presently, Langdon was in doubt concerning the correctness of his copy of an important variant reading, and Poebel even failed to notice the presence of the same reading in his text. It is the purpose of this article to test some of Lyon's conclusions by means of the variant readings furnished by the new versions and then to go on to a discussion of the position and character of the "sacred" women of Babylonia. To get the problem before us as quickly as possible, let

<sup>1</sup> *Studies in the History of Religions Presented to C. H. Toy*, pp. 341 f.

me set down the numbers of the paragraphs of the Code under discussion, followed by the readings of the names of the consecrated women as found (1) in the standard edition of the Code (C), (2) in the version published by Langdon (L), and (3) in that given by Poebel (P).

	C	L	P
§ 40.....	<i>SAL-ME</i>		
§ 110.....	<i>SAL-ME</i> , <i>NIN-AN</i> ( <i>entum</i> )		<i>SA[L-M]E</i> à <i>NIN-</i> [AN] (Col. 5)
§ 127.....	<i>NIN-AN</i>		Lines containing names broken away (Col. 8)
§ 137.....	<i>SAL-ME</i>		Lines containing names broken away (Col. 9)
§ 144-47.....	<i>SAL-ME</i>	<i>DA[M]</i> (Obv. Col. 1)	<i>DAM*</i> (Col. 10)
§ 178-79.....	<i>NIN-AN</i> , <i>SAL-ME</i> , <i>zi-ik-ru-um</i>	<i>NIN-AN</i> , <i>zi-ik-ru-um</i> (Rev. Col. 4)	
§ 180.....	<i>SAL-ME</i> <i>gágûm</i> , <i>zi-</i> <i>ik-ru-um</i>		
§ 181.....	<i>SAL-ME</i> , <i>NU-GIG</i> ( <i>kadistum</i> ), <i>NU-</i> <i>BAR</i> ( <i>zêrmasitum</i> )		
§ 182.....	<i>SAL-ME</i> <i>dMarduk</i>		
§ 187, 192, 193..	<i>sal zi-ik-ru-um</i>		

\* See discussion of this variant below.

Let us begin with §§ 137 and 144-47, which have to do with divorce and the question of the "second" wife, that is, the concubine.<sup>1</sup> The ideogram *SAL-ME* found in these sections of the standard edition of the Code has usually been interpreted as the equivalent of the ideogram *DAM*=*aššatum*, "wife." Such is the interpretation of Harper, Ungnad,<sup>2</sup> and others. Lyon, on the other hand, believes that the ideogram has the same meaning in these sections as elsewhere and translates it by "votary." Now it is true that the only reason scholars had for assuming (there was no proof) that *SAL-ME* meant *aššatum*, "wife," in these sections was the content of the sections themselves interpreted in the light of other portions of the Code. That *SAL-ME* is not the ideogram scholars expect to find here may be seen from a slip on the part of Ungnad.<sup>3</sup> He is comparing § 145 with § 148. Evidently he quotes them from the transliterated text, for in his notes he speaks of the ideogram in § 145 as being *DAM*. It

<sup>1</sup> See following note.

<sup>2</sup> Köhler und Ungnad, *Hammurabi's Gesetz* (hereafter K u. U), II, 124.

<sup>3</sup> *OLZ*, XVIII (1915), 73 f.; Ungnad shows that the ideogram for concubine, *ŠU-GE-tum*, was pronounced *šanitum* in the Semitic. The concubine was the "second" wife.

is, of course, *SAL-ME*. In like manner Poebel, in his notes on the new edition which he had published,<sup>1</sup> fails to note *DAM* as the reading in § 145 and § 146 instead of the *SAL-ME* of the standard text. He, too, seems to have forgotten that *DAM* was not found in these sections of the stela text.

Now it is just this variant *DAM* in Poebel's edition which justifies the usual interpretation of §§ 137, 144-47. In Langdon's text, copied at Constantinople, the sign *DAM* in § 145 (Obv. Col. 1) is drawn as if rubbed on the original. In his notes (p. 7) Langdon expresses the belief that the *aššatum* (*DAM*) instead of *SAL-ME* might be due to an error in his copy. That the text was copied correctly is shown by the readings of Poebel's version. In this version both § 145 and § 146 are found (Col. 10), but many of the signs are badly rubbed. Some are gone. Nevertheless, in § 145 the first half of the ideogram *DAM* is preserved, while in § 146 the second half of the same ideogram is left. The new versions, therefore, have *DAM*, the usual ideogram for "wife," in §§ 145, 146, and it is practically certain that the same sign also stood in §§ 137, 144, 147. These paragraphs of the Code deal then with ordinary wives, not with wives who were also "votaries," as Lyon believes.

Unfortunately neither of the new versions contains § 40, the only other section of the Code where the meaning of the ideogram *SAL-ME* is in doubt. The interpretation of this law is in doubt anyway, and new light upon any portion of it would have been most welcome.

We turn now to the paragraphs of the Code whose enactments undoubtedly concern temple women. The variant readings should first be noted.

In § 110 the standard edition reads, "If a *SAL-ME NIN-AN* (*entum*) not living in a convent, have opened a wineshop," etc. Here the *SAL-ME* has been taken as a kind of determinative before the *NIN-AN*: Harper, *aššatum NIN-AN*, "priestess"; Rogers (*Cuneiform Parallels*) *išippatum entum*, "female votary," Ungnad (*Texte und Bilder*, 153), "'Nonne' (oder) Gottesschwester." The version published by Poebel seems to have read *SAL-ME ù NIN-AN*, that is, "priestess or nun." In § 179, L omits *SAL-ME* between *NIN-AN*

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, 161 f., 193 f., 225 f., 257 f.

and *zikrum*. As we shall see below, these variants do not affect the meaning of these sections of the Code.

In discussing the position and character of the consecrated women of the Code, Lyon seems greatly concerned to prove that "the Code of Hammurabi furnishes no basis for an indictment of any class of these consecrated women" (p. 356). He combats the idea that any one of them was a real mother, but unmarried, and hence "a low character." He admits that the *ḫadišum* and *zērmašītum* had bad reputations in the magical literature and elsewhere.<sup>1</sup> "But such passages," he thinks, "do not seem to require any modification of the impression which the Code makes as to the character of the consecrated women in whose behalf it legislates" (p. 365).

Now it seems to me that Lyon has failed to make the proper differentiation between the various classes of "consecrated" women mentioned in the Code. While he has made abundant use of the legal documents approximately contemporaneous with the promulgation of the Code (that is, First Dynasty documents), I do not think that he has allowed all of these documents to present their evidence.

First as to the *SAL-ME*. She was evidently a priestess (*išippatum*) corresponding to the priest class *išippu*. The function of these priests (*išippātu*) was to cleanse (with holy water) and sanctify temples and other shrines.<sup>2</sup> Ordinarily a particular kind of *SAL-ME* is mentioned in the legal documents—*SAL-ME* <sup>d</sup>*Marduk*, *SAL-ME* <sup>d</sup>*Šamaš*, that is, priestess of Marduk or priestess of Shamash. So we have the Marduk priestess specified in § 182 of the Code, the "convent priestess (*SAL-ME* *gâgûm*)" in § 180.<sup>3</sup>

Lyon says further:

In the marriage laws [§§ 137, 144–47] in which the votary [*SAL-ME*] figures it seems that she does not bear. The specific word for bearing, *alâdu*,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Frank, *Studien zur babylonischen Religion*, pp. 47 f.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 9.

<sup>3</sup> In the texts published by Ranke (*Babylonian Legal and Business Documents from the Time of the First Dynasty of Babylon*) *SAL-ME* <sup>d</sup>*Šamaš* and *SAL* <sup>d</sup>*Šamaš* seem to be used interchangeably for "priestess of Shamash." Strictly speaking, *SAL* <sup>d</sup>*Šamaš* would mean "woman (*sinništum*) of Shamash" while *SAL-ME* <sup>d</sup>*Šamaš* is "priestess (*išippatum*) of Shamash." *ME* = *išib*, *išippu*; cf. Delitzsch, *Sumerisches Glossar*, p. 29. This interchange of *SAL-ME* and *SAL* probably accounts for the appearance of *SAL-ME* in §§ 137, 144–47 of the standard edition of the Code. There it means "wife," as we saw from the new versions. That *SAL* = *sinništum*, "woman," was used elsewhere in the Code for "wife" (a usage common to many languages) may be seen by comparing paragraphs 141 and 142.

is never applied to her, though it is used about twenty times of other classes of wife (*aššatu*, *hirtu*, the secondary wife, and the widow who has married again). The votary wife "causes her husband to have" children (*ušarši*, *uštābši*). . . . This consistent difference in the use of terms can hardly be accidental, and the conclusion seems natural that, as a rule at least, the votary wife was barren.

But we saw above that the new versions of the Code show that the ordinary wife and not the votary wife is referred to in these sections. The ordinary wife in Babylonia "presented her husband with children" just as she does in other lands. Nevertheless, it would remove the doubt as to whether or not the priestess (*SAL-ME*) bore children if we should find the word *alādu* used in connection with the mention of her children.

In a legal text<sup>1</sup> we read of the adoption of a son by Bunini-abi and his wife Hushutum, a priestess of Marduk: "Even if Bunini-abi and Hushutum, the priestess of Marduk, should have children (*liršu*), Shamash-abili [the adopted son] is their oldest brother." Here the word used is a form of *rašū*, "to have, get" (cf. *ušarši*, above). The same word is used in another adoption text<sup>2</sup> whose wording is in other respects also almost identical with the one just quoted. But here the adopting mother is not a priestess. That the *SAL-ME* did bear children is rendered practically certain by two very interesting texts.<sup>3</sup> Absolute certainty on this point is not reached, owing to the fact that the woman is not called a priestess in so many words; but the provision for carrying her chair to the temple of Marduk makes it reasonably certain that she was a Marduk priestess. Warad-Shamash takes as his wives two sisters, Taram-Saggil and Iltani. After the usual formulas found in marriage contracts, we read: "And Iltani shall wash the feet of Taram-Saggil and carry her chair to the house of her god. If Taram-Saggil is cross, Iltani shall be cross, if she is happy, she shall be happy.<sup>4</sup> Her seal she shall not open. 10 *ka* of flour she shall grind and bake for her." The last line is doubtful. The Babylonians were as careless with their pronouns as we are, but the meaning is generally clear.

<sup>1</sup> Also referred to by Lyon; cf. K u. U, III, No. 17.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 19.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, Nos. 2 and 3.

<sup>4</sup> For another interpretation of these lines see Schorr, *Urkunden des altbabylonischen Zivil- und Prozessrechts*, p. 11.

Note that the secondary wife was not to open her sister's mail. But the important statements come in the contract drawn up with the secondary wife. From this we learn that the chair is to be carried into the temple of *Marduk*, and "*the children which they have borne or shall bear, are their children*" (that is, the children of both).<sup>1</sup>

The *NIN-AN* or *entum* was closely related to the *SAL-ME* (*išippatum*). An interesting text published by Professor Clay<sup>2</sup> gives an account of the dedication of the daughter of Nabonidus to the office of *entum*. In Col. II. 10 f. we find her duties summed up in the word *išippatum*. As we saw above, this word designates the function of the *išippu*-priest and probably also that of the *išippatum* (*SAL-ME*). We have already referred to § 110, where the *entum* and *SAL-ME* are grouped together. This paragraph shows that the *SAL-ME* and the *entum* might or might not be living in a convent. The legal documents have shown us that the *SAL-ME* might marry, live in her own house, and have children. Other documents make it clear that many *SAL-ME* of Shamash, Ninib, and other gods lived in convents. We hear much of the convent (*gâgûm*) of the Shamash priestesses. But we have no evidence that the *entum* ever married or had children of her own, or that she adopted sons or daughters.<sup>3</sup> The presumption is that ordinarily she lived in a convent, so we may call her a nun. Note particularly that the *entum* is the only temple woman mentioned in § 127. "If a man have caused the finger to be pointed at a nun or the wife of a man and have not justified himself, they shall bring that man before the judge," etc.

In § 181 we have two more classes of priestesses mentioned: *SAL-ME* *ḫadištam* *ù lu zêrmašîtam*. The more general term priestess (*SAL-ME*) is used, and then there follow the names of the two special kinds, the *ḫadištam* and the *zêrmašîtum*.

<sup>1</sup> *mârû meš ma-la-a wa-al-du ù i-wa-la-du mârû meš-ši-na-ma*. There is one more point which should be noted. The scribe has written the name of the father of Taram-Saggil and Iltani as Sin-abushu in one text and as Shamash-tatum in the other. Nevertheless, there cannot be any doubt that the two texts refer to the same persons.

<sup>2</sup> *Miscellaneous Inscriptions*, No. 45.

<sup>3</sup> There is only one text (to my knowledge) which might be used to show that the *entum* might have children, namely, the Legend of Sargon (cf. *AJSL*, 1917, p. 146). But it is doubtful whether Sargon's mother was a nun. The word used is *enitum*. I may add that in my discussion of this term I failed to do what I am insisting upon here—that is, to differentiate between the different kinds of temple women.

That the *ḫadištum* was a temple prostitute is certain from the literature cited by Lyon.<sup>1</sup> He would, however, distinguish between the *ḫadištum* and *zērmašītum* of these late texts and the women of the same name mentioned in the Code. That this will not do seems to me to follow from a number of legal documents dating from the First Dynasty.

There is no record of the marriage of a *ḫadištum*, yet they were regularly employed as wet-nurses! In a document dated in the reign of Hammurabi<sup>2</sup> we read: "Zuhuntum, the wife of Anum-kinum, gave her child to the *ḫadištum* Iltani to nurse. Thereupon she was unable to give Iltani the nursing fee for three years (nursing), board, oil for anointing, and clothing. 'Take the child, let it be your child,' said Zuhuntum to Iltani, the *ḫadištum*." Iltani takes the child, but pays the mother three shekels of silver, the difference between the nursing fee and the market value of the child.

In another instance<sup>3</sup> a child is given to a wet-nurse who is not a *ḫadištum*. There is a dispute as to the pay she should receive. The case is taken before the judges. "Thereupon the judges called in the *ḫadištum* (plural). Whereupon she received her nursing fee." The prostitutes were, of course, called in as professionals in order that the judges might determine what was the proper fee.

Take another case.<sup>4</sup> Shalurtum, the wife of Enim-Nami, adopts Awirtum, the daughter of Hupatum and Rubatum, his wife. The child is still an infant, so the mother is paid one and two-thirds shekels of silver for bringing her up. Then Awirtum is made a *ḫadištum* "in order that she may let her mother, Shalurtum, 'eat food.'" Can there be any doubt as to the source of the income of the girl? We may imagine that the parents of this child were poor and disposed of their daughter at the best price they could get. They might have sold her into slavery, but this would have been the last straw.

In another document,<sup>5</sup> from the Cassite period, we learn of the adoption of Etirtum by Ina-Uruk-rishat, "who had no daughter." She adopted the girl in order that her daughter Etirtum might pour out water for her when she died. By the terms of the contract

<sup>1</sup> P. 365 (see above).

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, IV, No. 781.

<sup>2</sup> K u. U, III, No. 32.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, III, No. 24.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, III, No. 33.



Ina-Uruk-rishat might give the girl to a husband or make her a prostitute, but in no case might she make her her slave.

The other class of priestess mentioned in § 181 is the *zêrmašîtum*.<sup>1</sup> From the legal documents we learn that a Marduk priestess (*SAL-ME* <sup>d</sup>*Marduk*) might also be a *zêrmašîtum*. Awil-Sin gives his daughter, a Marduk priestess and *zêrmašîtum*, together with a handsome dowry, to Warad-Shamash. "For all time, her children are her heirs."<sup>2</sup>

Sin-eribam, at the time of his daughter's betrothal, designates certain gifts which are to be given her. "Thereupon Shubultum, her mother, Kishat-Sin, Igmil-Sin, and Sippar-lisher, her brothers, gave them to her and let her enter the house of Ilushu-bani, her husband. . . . For all time, her children are her heirs."<sup>3</sup>

Somewhat different is the following: " $\frac{1}{3}$  *sar* of land . . . . 1 slave, 1 bed and 1 'sailor-chair'; this is the portion of Lamassi, the *zêrmašîtum*, daughter of Upi-magir. As soon as a man marries her, she shall take her personal property and enter the house of her husband. Her house (real-estate) and her residue (?) are her brothers exclusively."<sup>4</sup>

There remains the *zikrum* (§§ 178-80, 187, 192, 193). The spelling of the name is peculiar. It is a masculine form and is written as a nominative, no matter what its position in the sentence. That <sup>sal</sup> *zikrum* is an ideogram for a form like *zikirtum* was suggested by Ungnad, who also holds that it is evidently to be connected with the *zîkrêti* (women of the harem) of the Assyrian inscriptions.<sup>5</sup> Here he was on the right track, but failed to follow up his clue. He still translates *zikrum* with "Dirne,"<sup>6</sup> making it a parallel of *ḫadišum*.

Now, it is noticeable that the *SAL-ME* (*išippatum*), *NIN-AN* (*entum*), *ḫadišum*, and *zêrmašîtum* are all mentioned in the religious literature. But the name of the *zikrum* does not appear.<sup>7</sup> It would seem, therefore, that she does not belong to the priestesses.

<sup>1</sup> On the etymology of this word see Schorr, *op. cit.*, p. 564.

<sup>2</sup> K u. U, III, No. 9.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, III, No. 10.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, III, No. 50.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, II, p. 134.

<sup>6</sup> *Babylonische Briefe*, p. 299.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Clay, *op. cit.*, p. 67; Frank, *op. cit.*, pp. 9 f.

This is, of course, an *argumentum e silentio*, but positive evidence that she was a palace woman, not a temple woman, is, I believe, at hand. But first a word as to how she probably became associated with the temple women in the minds of scholars.

A man is known by the company he keeps. So is a woman. Now in §§ 178 f. of the Code the *zikrum* is mentioned along with the priestess and the nun. This put her in the ranks of the temple women, and through guesses as to the etymology of her name she finally landed in the class of prostitutes.<sup>1</sup> In §§ 187, 192, 193, however, she is mentioned together with the *manzaz-pânim muzaz ekallim*, "the chamberlain stationed in the palace." The writer feels sure that if these sections of the Code had preceded, instead of following, §§ 178 f. the *zikrum* would never have been classed with the temple women, and her evident connection with the harem would have been noticed.

The sections in which the *zikrum* is mentioned along with the chamberlain have to do with the adopted children of these two classes. An interesting letter<sup>2</sup> concerning such an adopted son has come down to us. Like most letters, it is full of linguistic difficulties, but the sense is reasonably clear: "To Taribum speak: Thus saith Adyatum: 'May Shamash grant thee life.'" This is the customary introduction. Now we get down to the subject-matter: "The scribe X-bani has made the following statement: thus he spoke: 'A father-house I have not, therefore, I entered the house of the <sup>sal</sup> *zikritum* as a son (*ana bi-it sal zi-ik-ri-tim a-na ma-ru-tim i-ru-ub*, literally, the house of the *zikritum*<sup>3</sup> for sonship I entered). The house which I entered as (adopted) son, to the exit of the palace they caused to go forth.'" The last sentence is difficult. I follow Ebeling<sup>4</sup> rather than Ungnad. The adopted son is turned out of his home, but also *out of the palace*. The *bit sal zikritim* is connected with the palace, not with the temple. The rest of the letter is not particularly difficult: "A letter of my lord (the king, to the effect that) you are to give me a home, has come to you; why have you not carried it out? I shall bring complaint." Adyatum advises that "either they give him

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Lyon, p. 350.

<sup>2</sup> Ungnad, *Babylonische Briefe*, No. 164.

<sup>3</sup> The form might be singular or plural.

<sup>4</sup> *RA*, X (1913), pp. 24f.

back the home he entered as son or else furnish him a home just like it(?); in order that he may not enter a complaint."

The only other mention (to my knowledge) of the *zikrum*, outside of the Code, is in a pay-list from the time of Ammisaduga.<sup>1</sup> Grain is paid out for the keep of weavers (female) and the <sup>sal</sup> *zikrum*, for offerings, for the board of the Sutean, the watchman of the grain-field, etc. Now weavers and spinners, when they are female, are frequently mentioned in the pay-lists of the harem. Genouillac has published and studied a number of old Sumerian texts,<sup>2</sup> in which are given, among other things, the number and pay of the women employed in the harem, the house of Baranamtara, the wife of Lugalanda, Shagshag, the queen of Urukagina, and other royal ladies. Some of these women were the servants of the queen who looked after her wants—the table, etc.; others were spinners; still others looked after the offerings. The list mentioning the weavers, *zikrum*, etc., may well have been one of the pay-rolls of the harem.<sup>3</sup> However, in this discussion we must not lose sight of the fact that from earliest Sumerian days there was the closest connection between the palace and the temple.

Hammurabi's legislation on the rights and privileges of the temple women can be understood only when read as part of the legislation on the family. The temple woman started out in life as the daughter of Babylonian parents. Ordinarily the daughter was given in marriage to some suitor acceptable to her father,<sup>4</sup> and thus was formed the nucleus of a new family. A marriage was not legal unless a marriage contract had been drawn up (§ 128). The economic foundation of the new family was laid at the time of the marriage. The groom brought to the prospective father-in-law a bride-price (*tirhâtum*). Already in the time of the First Dynasty of Babylon the custom of "tying the bride-price to the girdle of the bride," that is, of giving it to her, had become the regular procedure. The groom also brought a gift (*nudunnum*) to the bride. The bride's

<sup>1</sup> K u. U, III, No. 773.

<sup>2</sup> *La Société Sumérienne*, p. xxxii.

<sup>3</sup> For the harem of the Assyrian kings, cf. Kohler und Ungnad, *Assyrische Rechtsurkunden*, pp. 445 f.

<sup>4</sup> Or mother in case of the father's death. If both parents were dead, the brothers gave her away.

father settled upon her a dowry (*šeriktum*). This dowry seems to have been all the daughter could expect from her father's estate. On her death it went to her children (§ 162). In case she died childless it reverted to the paternal estate (*bīt abiša*, § 163).

But the Babylonian father might choose to dispose of his daughter in a way different from the one just described. He might give her to a god or to the king for his harem. The Code is specific as to her *šeriktum*. This was to revert to her brothers unless the father had inserted into the deed the provision "that she might dispose of her estate as she pleased," and had thus granted her "full discretion" (§§ 178, 179). In the legal documents such discretion is usually given by the phrase "her children are her heirs."<sup>1</sup> In case the father had not granted his daughter her *šeriktum* during his lifetime, "after he had gone to his fate" she received a share in the goods of her father's estate. This share varied according to the service to which her father had devoted her. If she had been sent to the monastery (*išippat gâgûm*) as nun or priestess, or to the palace as *zikrum*, her share was equal to the portion of a son. She enjoyed it as long as she lived, but on her death it went to her brothers (§ 180). In case she became a priestess (not resident in a monastery), a *kađištum* or *zêrmašîtum*, her share was only one-third the portion of a son. Again it reverted to her brothers on her death (§ 181). If, however, she was a priestess of Marduk, her share was one-third the portion of a son, but she paid no tax and she might dispose of it "after her death, . . . wherever it seemed good to her" (§ 182).

Why a son's portion in some cases and only one-third of this in others? Was it because one class was held in higher esteem than the other? Possibly. But the outstanding characteristic of the Hammurabi legislation is its insistence on economic justice. The income of the nun and priestess who lived in the monastery was fixed. It consisted of the income from her portion of her father's estate and such property as other priestesses settled upon her.<sup>2</sup> On the other hand, the priestess of Marduk (Shamash, etc.) might marry and live with her husband. Her portion of the paternal estate was only a third of the portion of a son. Similarly, a third of a son's portion went to

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 8.

<sup>2</sup> Of this we hear much in the legal literature.

the *ḫadištum* and *zêrmašītum*. Their income was undoubtedly augmented by the "hire of a harlot." When the receipts began to fall off (?), the *ḫadištum* might earn board and keep, together with small wages, as wet-nurse. One wonders what became of the children of the *ḫadištum*. The *zêrmašītum* might marry. Did her marriage occur after a period of service in the temple?<sup>1</sup>

The *zikrum* was treated like the nun or priestess who lived in the monastery (§ 180, see above).<sup>2</sup> Her share was equal to the portion of a son. Royalty has always shown its ability to look out for itself, and many sections of the Code bear witness that Hammurabi's line was no exception to this rule.

The "vestal virgin" and the temple prostitute were recognized members of ancient society from before the days of Hammurabi down to Roman times.<sup>3</sup> There is no particular reason why we should label the *ḫadištum* and *zêrmašītum* "bad characters." Their occupation had the sanction of church and state, but that it was "prostitution," though "sacred," cannot be denied.

<sup>1</sup> Should the evidence for this be forthcoming, it would furnish us with the particular case of which the well-known statement of Herodotus is probably a generalization.

<sup>2</sup> This section alone should have kept scholars from classing the *zikrum* with the prostitutes.

<sup>3</sup> See Kohler und Peiser, *Hammurabi's Gesetz*, I, 109 f.